

11-24-1997

## University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda, November 24, 1997

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©1997 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents)



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda, November 24, 1997" (1997). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 1146.  
[https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/1146](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1146)

This Agenda is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@uni.edu](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

**UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**  
**Agenda for Meeting of November 24, 1997**  
**3:15 PM, Board Room, Gilchrist Hall**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

1. Approval of the Minutes of March 31, 1997
2. Approval of the Minutes of September 29, 1997
3. Approval of the Minutes of November 10, 1997

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Call for press identification
2. Comments from Chair Isakson
3. Comments from Provost Marlin

**CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING**

- 664 Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Examine The University of Northern Iowa Policy for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct.
- 665 Reports From the Educational Policy Commission and Northern Iowa Student Government on the resolution "Clarifying school policy when class sessions contain sexually explicit course materials" submitted by Elaine Jaquith.
- 666 Resolution from Northern Iowa Student Government regarding Course Packets.
- 667 Request for Emeritus Status from Argelia C. Hawley, Department of Teaching.
- 668 Report from the Ad Hoc Senate Administrative Operations Committee
- 669 Report from the Senate Budget Committee on New Spending Proposals

**NEW BUSINESS**

**OLD BUSINESS**

**CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

- 661 586 Report of the Senate Strategic Plan Committee
- 662 587 Request for Emeritus Status from Alan R. Orr, Department of Biology

**ADJOURNMENT**

---

## **DRAFT FOR SENATORS' REVIEW**

### **Minutes of the University Faculty Senate Meeting November 10, 1997 1526**

**Present:** Kenneth Basom, Michael Blackwell, William (Bud) Bowlin, Scott Cawelti, Carol Cooper, Lyn Countryman, Kenneth DeNault, Sherry Gable, Andrew Gilpin, Hans Isakson, James Jurgenson, Katherine Van Wormer (for Suzanne McDevitt), Richard McGuire, Philip Patton, Dean Primrose, Jerome Soneson, Paul Shand, Sarina Chen (for Laura Terlip), Calvin Thomas, Barbara Weeg

**Absent:** None

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Isakson call the Senate to order at 3:16 p.m.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. Approval of the minutes of March 31, 1997 was deferred.
2. Approval of the minutes of September 29, 1997 was deferred.
3. *Gable moved (Cawelti seconded) that the minutes of October 27, 1997 be approved as corrected. Motioned passed.*
4. Approval of minutes of September 15, 1997 with additional corrections was deferred. Isakson suggested that correction of minutes be made in the form of a motion.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Press identification: None present.
2. Chair Isakson distributed the college curriculum to review list. He said that curriculum *process* and review and process procedures set out the role of the Senate in approving curriculum matters. Hard copies of materials will be sent to senators. The curriculum package will be calendared and docketed for the next senate meeting.
3. Chair Isakson said the performance indicators budget recommendations will be considered as early as December 8th or next semester due to a full docket.
4. Provost Marlin was not present because she was meeting with the Task Force Committee. No announcements from the Provost.
5. Faculty Chair Cawelti said the Regents' Faculty Award of Excellence deadline is today. The deadline will be extended.
6. Cawelti distributed a copy of a possible new emeritus policy. He said that no comment is necessary. It is primarily Iowa State University's policy.
7. Vice Chair Gable had no announcements.

### **TABLED DOCKET ITEMS**

- 583 Report from the Educational Policy Committee on When/Where Basic Skills/Competencies should be Taught. The report of the Educational Policy Committee was tabled at the last meeting. *DeNault moved (Primrose seconded) to take the item from the table. Motion passed.*  
In the discussion, Educational Policy Committee Chair Russ Campbell was asked where should basic skills be taught? He said the committee wasn't sure what was meant by basic skills. The charge was too broad to handle. The question relates to what skills students bring to the university.  
*Gilpin moved (Soneson seconded) that the report be accepted.*  
*Motion passed.*

### **CONSIDERATION OF CALENDARED ITEMS**

- 661 Report from the Senate Strategic Plan Committee. *Thomas moved (Countryman seconded) to docket in regular order. Motion passed 11-5.* Calendar item 661 is docketed as 586.
- 662 Request for Emeritus Status from Alan R. Orr, Department of Biology. *Item docketed in regular order.* Docketed as 587.
- 663 Resolution on Class Scheduling from Professor Rajendran.  
*It was moved and seconded to docket in regular order.*  
*DeNault moved (Cooper seconded) to substitute that the item be referred to the Calendar Committee and the Educational Policy Committee.*  
*Motion to substitute passed*  
*Motion as substituted passed.*

### **NEW BUSINESS**

None.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

1. Election of the slate of candidates for the ad hoc Community College Articulation Committee. Nominations were opened.  
Gable nominated Jim Kelly for the faculty at large position on the committee.  
Isakson nominated Darrel Davis of the General Education Committee.  
Jean Neibauer, Academic Advising Office and Linda Corbin of the College of Business were nominated for the academic advising position.  
*It was moved and seconded to close nominations. Motion passed.*  
Ballots were distributed.
2. Ad Hoc Committee to Examine Faculty Participation on University Committees. Item

was discussed but no action was taken.

## CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

659    584    Policy for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct approved by the Graduate Council on October 9, 1997.

*Isakson moved (Bowlin seconded) to accept the report and transmit it to the Cabinet.*

*Isakson moved (Cawelti seconded) to amend the report as follows:*

*A. Change the definition of Fabrication on page 4 to read as follows:*

*Fabrication is the manufacture of false data, either partially or totally, for the purpose of deception.*

*B. Change the Institutional Administrative Actions on page 16 as follows:*

*1. add the words "with pay" following the word "suspension."*

*2. delete everything following the word "suspension" to the end of item (2).*

*3. add a new item as follows:*

*(3) Any Institutional Administrative Actions proposed to be taken against a member of the faculty shall be held in suspense until after the University has negotiated with United Faculty a faculty grievance procedure that applies to these actions.*

*C. Add the following item under the subheading Other Considerations on page 17:*

*F. The conduct of any person that is the subject of inquiry or investigation under this policy shall not be the subject of inquiry or investigation for violation of the Ethics (Professional) and Academic Responsibility provisions of the University of Northern Iowa Policy and Procedures Manual.*

Isakson said that the changes contained in his amendment would not disqualify the University from receiving federal funds.

Countryman distributed a statement from Barbara Lounsberry on behalf of United Faculty which asks that the Faculty Senate request the Cabinet to delay approval of the policy for faculty "until the completion of current negotiations to develop a new disciplinary grievance procedure for faculty are completed."

Al Hays, Chair of the Graduate Faculty, said UNI has received over \$7 million in funds over the last five years and he didn't want future funds jeopardized by not having a policy.

Cooper raised the question of the person falsely accused.

Question was called on the amendment.

*The Isakson amendment failed.*

Gilpin suggested that the policy be referred to some kind of ad hoc committee and said that some features of the policy are troubling.

Dean Somervill said the graduate college has been working on the policy for four years. The policy follows the model policy of the Office of Research Integrity. He agrees with Gilpin that some wording changes are needed, but he was concerned about a delay. The absence of a policy could potentially affect the university's getting federal funding.

Perhaps could approve the policy in principle and make changes later.

*Cawelti moved (seconded) to substitute that the policy be referred to a committee of three appointed by the Chair to make appropriate changes and to report back to the Senate in timely fashion.*

*Motion to substitute passed.*

*Motion as substituted passed.*

660     585     Request from Vice Chair Gable, Senator DeNault, Professor Haack to establish a Senate Oversight Committee for the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching.

*Gable moved (DeNault seconded) to establish a Senate oversight committee for the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching.*

*Cooper moved (Weeg seconded) to amend to add "a member of the library faculty to the committee and the director of the CET as an ex officio member."*

*Amendment passed.*

*Cawelti moved (Soneson seconded) to strike "oversight" and insert "advisory" in the name of the committee.*

*Amendment passed.*

*Main motion as amended passed.*

*Cooper moved (DeNault seconded) to adjourn.*

*Motion passed.*

Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Skaine, Senate Secretary  
(with assistance from John M. Butler)

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA FACULTY SENATE**

Calendar Number: 664

Docket: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: Report From the Ad Hoc Committee to Examine The University of Northern Iowa Policy for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct

**Standard Motions**

- \_\_\_ 1. Place at head of the docket, out of regular order.
- \_\_\_ 2. Docket in regular order.
- \_\_\_ 3. Docket because of special circumstances for \_\_\_\_\_  
and notify sender(s).
- \_\_\_ 4. Refer to (standing committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 5. Refer to (administrative officer) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 6. Return to (ad hoc committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 7. Return to petitioner with request for a more specific proposal.
- \_\_\_ 8. Return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation.
- \_\_\_ 9. Return to petitioner because of decision not to docket at this time.
- \_\_\_ 10. Other procedural disposition \_\_\_\_\_

---

**NOTES**

Report

Of The

Ad Hoc Committee to Examine  
The University of Northern Iowa  
Policy for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct

As Approved by the Graduate Council  
on October 9, 1997

Submitted by

Andrew Gilpin,  
Hans R. Isakson, and  
Ira Simet

November 17, 1997



The Ad Hoc Committee was formed at the request of the Faculty Senate to examine the proposed Policy for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct approved by the Graduate Council on October 9, 1997. This particular policy statement will be referred to as the Graduate Council Policy through out this report.

The Chair of the Senate appointed three Committee members: Professors Gilpin, Isakson, and Simet. The Committee was charged with recommending to the Senate a policy that would comply with pertinent federal regulations that would also address concerns expressed by Senators during the Senate's meeting on November 10, 1997. Furthermore, the Committee was charged with completing its work in a timely fashion, because of the urgency for the adoption by the University of some sort of scientific misconduct policy that is in compliance with the pertinent federal regulations.

The Committee examined the Graduate Council Policy as well as the Model Policy for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct propagated by the Office of Research Integrity, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The latter policy is referred to as the Model Policy through out the rest of this report. The Committee also examined the University of Northern Iowa Policy and Procedures Manual.

Based upon the Committee's review of these policies and its investigation into the practices at other universities, the following findings are reported:

1. The Graduate Council Policy is based largely upon the Model Policy with one major exception. The Model Policy is designed to apply *only* to individuals engaged in research that is supported by or for which support is requested from Public Health Services (PHS). The Graduate Council Policy is designed to apply to everyone

engaged in research activities at the University of Northern Iowa, including faculty, staff, and students, regardless of the funding of the research.

2. The Graduate Council Policy defines with greater detail than the Model Policy the terms used in the definition of scientific misconduct.
3. United Faculty expressed grave concerns regarding the potential of the Graduate Council Policy violating the Master Agreement between the Board of Regents and United Faculty and recommended that the Senate not approve or adopt the Graduate Council Policy.
4. Several Senators expressed concerns regarding the definition of scientific misconduct in general and the appendix (Examples of “Other Practices Which Involve Scientific Misconduct”) of the Graduate Council Policy.
5. The State University of Iowa and Iowa State University have adopted the Model Policy at their institutions with few faculty concerns.
6. The Office of Research Integrity, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services reports that over 900 universities have adopted the Model Policy or some variant of it.
7. Neither the Model Policy nor the Graduate Council Policy is widely known or understood by faculty at UNI.
8. The University of Northern Iowa already has a policy (Ethics (Professional) and Academic Responsibility) that overlaps with both the Graduate Council Policy and the Model Policy.

Based upon the above findings, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. The Graduate Council Policy should be made public on campus, preferably by posting it on the University's Web page, with announcements of how to access it sent to any University employee to whom the policy will apply. Commentary from the University community regarding the Graduate Council Policy should be sent to the Faculty Senate.

Rationale: The Graduate Council Policy is designed to apply to all university employees and students. But, most university employees and students have had little if any opportunity to comment upon it. Given the broad investigative powers and strong sanctions contained in the Graduate Council Policy, all those to whom it is to apply should have an opportunity to comment upon it, *before* it is adopted as University policy.

2. The University Cabinet should adopt <sup>temporarily, until a university policy is approved</sup> the Model Policy with *no change* <sup>in</sup> its narrow scope of applicability (e.g. *only* to individuals engaged in research that is supported by or for which support is requested from Public Health Services <sup>and National Science Foundation (NSF)</sup> (PHS)), while the Senate collects input from the University community regarding the Graduate Council Policy.

Rationale: The University is urgently in need of a scientific misconduct policy that complies with the pertinent federal regulations. The Model Policy satisfies this need, while allowing the University community time to examine and comment upon the broader Graduate Council Policy.

3. The Faculty Senate should revise the Graduate Council Policy to reflect comments regarding the Graduate Council Policy received from the University

community and transmit the revised Graduate Council Policy to the University Cabinet as a replacement for the temporary Model Policy.

Rationale: By allowing the entire University community more time to comment upon the Graduate Council Policy, the end result will be an even better policy. That is, the end result will be a scientific misconduct policy that everyone in the University community understands and has had an opportunity to comment upon.

## UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA FACULTY SENATE

Calendar Number: 665

Docket: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: Reports From the Educational Policy Commission and Northern Iowa Student Government on the resolution "Clarifying school policy when class sessions contain sexually explicit course materials" submitted by Elaine Jaquith.

### Standard Motions

- \_\_\_ 1. Place at head of the docket, out of regular order.
- \_\_\_ 2. Docket in regular order.
- \_\_\_ 3. Docket because of special circumstances for \_\_\_\_\_  
and notify sender(s).
- \_\_\_ 4. Refer to (standing committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 5. Refer to (administrative officer) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 6. Return to (ad hoc committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 7. Return to petitioner with request for a more specific proposal.
- \_\_\_ 8. Return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation.
- \_\_\_ 9. Return to petitioner because of decision not to docket at this time.
- \_\_\_ 10. Other procedural disposition \_\_\_\_\_

---

### NOTES



08 November 1997

Hans Isakson, Chair  
Faculty Senate  
University of Northern Iowa

Professor Isakson:

The following is the report of the Educational Policies Commission to the Faculty Senate on the proposal "Clarifying school policy when class sessions contain sexually explicit course materials." (submitted by Elaine Jaquith).

The Educational Policies Commission recommends that the Faculty Senate reject the the proposal "Clarifying school policy when class sessions contain sexually explicit course materials.", because endorsement of this proposal would be a violation of academic freedom as defined in the "1940 Statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure with 1970 interpretive comments" (pp. 1-10 in AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, 1995).

For the Educational Policies Commission,

*R. B. Campbell*  
R. B. Campbell

## ACADEMIC FREEDOM, TENURE, AND DUE PROCESS

---

**F**rom its inception in 1915, the main work of the Association has been in the area of academic freedom and tenure. Policy in this vital field has evolved gradually but continuously since that time. In the year of its founding the Association formulated a "Declaration of Principles," a statement on academic freedom and tenure and professional responsibility, which concluded with a section enumerating desirable procedures. This statement was put to immediate use by the organization's standing Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure in dealing with particular cases. Ten years later, the American Council on Education called a conference of a number of its constituent members, among them the AAUP, for the purpose of formulating a shorter statement that would take into account a decade's experience. The product of this effort became known as the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure; it was endorsed by the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) in 1925 and by this Association in 1926. Beginning in 1934, the two endorsing organizations again joined in a series of conferences. The result was the present policy document, the landmark 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, which in later years has been further endorsed by over 150 additional learned societies and educational associations, and which in 1970 was supplemented by a series of "Interpretive Comments."

Since 1940, the Association has issued other policy statements and reports which explain and develop aspects of the Statement of Principles and which also set forth procedural standards for academic due process in a variety of situations. The most generally used among these statements are the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings (developed jointly with the Association of American Colleges), the Statement on Procedural Standards in the Renewal or Nonrenewal of Faculty Appointments, and the Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The Association, also from its inception, has assumed responsibility not only for promulgating principles and standards but also for implementing them in specific situations. Believing that unrectified departures from sound academic standards do injury to the entire academic profession, the Association in addition publishes reports of ad hoc investigating committees on specific cases at colleges and universities that raise issues of academic freedom and tenure. These reports offer helpful guidance for the understanding of later situations confronted by the Association and constitute implementation of Association policy. They also contribute to the ongoing process of education in accepted principles and practice which is the central purpose and the most important activity of the Association.

# 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure

## With 1970 Interpretive Comments

---

*In 1940, following a series of joint conferences begun in 1934, representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) agreed upon a restatement of principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This restatement is known to the profession as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.*

*The 1940 Statement is printed below, followed by Interpretive Comments as developed by representatives of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1969. The governing bodies of the two associations, meeting respectively in November 1989 and January 1990, adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.*

**T**he purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to ensure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher<sup>1</sup> or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.[1]<sup>2</sup>

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

### ACADEMIC FREEDOM

- (a) Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
- (b) Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.[2] Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.[3]

<sup>1</sup>The word "teacher" as used in this document is understood to include the investigator who is attached to an academic institution without teaching duties.

<sup>2</sup>Bold-face numbers in brackets refer to Interpretive Comments which follow.



- (c) College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.[4]

## ACADEMIC TENURE

After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice:

1. The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.
2. Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank,[5] the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution, it may be agreed in writing that the new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years.[6] Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.[7]
3. During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.[8]
4. Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges and should have the opportunity to be heard in his or her own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon the case. The teacher should be permitted to be accompanied by an advisor of his or her own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from the teacher's own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.[9]
5. Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably *bona fide*.

## 1940 INTERPRETATIONS

At the conference of representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges on November 7-8, 1940, the following interpretations of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* were agreed upon:

1. That its operation should not be retroactive

2. That all tenure claims of teachers appointed prior to the endorsement should be determined in accordance with the principles set forth in the 1925 *Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.
3. If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph (a)(4) of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

## 1970 INTERPRETIVE COMMENTS

*Following extensive discussions on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with leading educational associations and with individual faculty members and administrators, a joint committee of the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges met during 1969 to reevaluate this key policy statement. On the basis of the comments received, and the discussions that ensued, the joint committee felt the preferable approach was to formulate interpretations of the Statement in terms of the experience gained in implementing and applying the Statement for over thirty years and of adapting it to current needs.*

*The committee submitted to the two associations for their consideration the following "Interpretive Comments." These interpretations were adopted by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in April 1970 and endorsed by the Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting as Association policy.*

*In the thirty years since their promulgation, the principles of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure have undergone a substantial amount of refinement. This has evolved through a variety of processes, including customary acceptance, understandings mutually arrived at between institutions and professors or their representatives, investigations and reports by the American Association of University Professors, and formulations of statements by that association either alone or in conjunction with the Association of American Colleges. These comments represent the attempt of the two associations, as the original sponsors of the 1940 Statement, to formulate the most important of these refinements. Their incorporation here as Interpretive Comments is based upon the premise that the 1940 Statement is not a static code but a fundamental document designed to set a framework of norms to guide adaptations to changing times and circumstances.*

*Also, there have been relevant developments in the law itself reflecting a growing insistence by the courts on due process within the academic community which parallels the essential concepts of the 1940 Statement; particularly relevant is the identification by the Supreme Court of academic freedom as a right protected by the First Amendment. As the Supreme Court said in *Keyishian v. Board of Regents* 385 U.S. 589 (1967), "Our Nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom."*

*The numbers refer to the designated portion of the 1940 Statement on which interpretive comment is made.*

1. The Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors have long recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. Both associations either separately or jointly have consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in their utterances as citizens, in the exercise of their responsibilities to the institution and to students, and in their conduct when resigning from their institution or when undertaking government-sponsored research. Of particular relevance is the *Statement on Professional Ethics*, adopted in 1966 as Associ-

ation policy. (A revision, adopted in 1987, was published in *Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP* 73 [July-August 1987]: 49.)

2. The intent of this statement is not to discourage what is "controversial." Controversy is at the heart of the free academic inquiry which the entire statement is designed to foster. The passage serves to underscore the need for teachers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject.

3. Most church-related institutions no longer need or desire the departure from the principle of academic freedom implied in the 1940 *Statement*, and we do not now endorse such a departure.

4. This paragraph is the subject of an interpretation adopted by the sponsors of the 1940 *Statement* immediately following its endorsement which reads as follows:

If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph (a)(4) of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

Paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom in the 1940 *Statement* should also be interpreted in keeping with the 1964 "Committee A Statement on Extramural Utterances" (*AAUP Bulletin* 51 [1965]: 29), which states *inter alia*: "The controlling principle is that a faculty member's expression of opinion as a citizen cannot constitute grounds for dismissal unless it clearly demonstrates the faculty member's unfitness for his or her position. Extramural utterances rarely bear upon the faculty member's fitness for the position. Moreover, a final decision should take into account the faculty member's entire record as a teacher and scholar."

Paragraph V of the *Statement on Professional Ethics* also deals with the nature of the "special obligations" of the teacher. The paragraph reads as follows:

As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of other obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

Both the protection of academic freedom and the requirements of academic responsibility apply not only to the full-time probationary and the tenured teacher, but also to all others, such as part-time faculty and teaching assistants, who exercise teaching responsibilities.

5. The concept of "rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank" is intended to include any person who teaches a full-time load regardless of the teacher's specific title.\*

6. In calling for an agreement "in writing" on the amount of credit given for a faculty member's prior service at other institutions, the *Statement* furthers the general policy of full understanding by the professor of the terms and conditions of the appointment. It does not necessarily follow that a professor's tenure rights have been violated because of the absence of a written agreement on this matter. Nonetheless, especially because of the variation in permissible institutional practices, a written understanding concerning these matters at the time of appointment is particularly appropriate and advantageous to both the individual and the institution.\*\*

\* For a discussion of this question, see the "Report of the Special Committee on Academic Personnel Ineligible for Tenure," *AAUP Bulletin* 52 (1966): 280-82.

\*\*For a more detailed statement on this question, see "On Crediting Prior Service Elsewhere as Part of the Probationary Period," *AAUP Bulletin* 64 (1978): 274-75.

7. The effect of this subparagraph is that a decision on tenure, favorable or unfavorable, must be made at least twelve months prior to the completion of the probationary period. If the decision is negative, the appointment for the following year becomes a terminal one. If the decision is affirmative, the provisions in the 1940 *Statement* with respect to the termination of service of teachers or investigators after the expiration of a probationary period should apply from the date when the favorable decision is made.

The general principle of notice contained in this paragraph is developed with greater specificity in the *Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment*, endorsed by the Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors (1964). These standards are:

Notice of nonreappointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment to the governing board, should be given in writing in accordance with the following standards:

- (1) Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
- (2) Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
- (3) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

Other obligations, both of institutions and of individuals, are described in the *Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members*, as endorsed by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors in 1961.

8. The freedom of probationary teachers is enhanced by the establishment of a regular procedure for the periodic evaluation and assessment of the teacher's academic performance during probationary status. Provision should be made for regularized procedures for the consideration of complaints by probationary teachers that their academic freedom has been violated. One suggested procedure to serve these purposes is contained in the *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, prepared by the American Association of University Professors.

9. A further specification of the academic due process to which the teacher is entitled under this paragraph is contained in the *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, jointly approved by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1958. This interpretive document deals with the issue of suspension, about which the 1940 *Statement* is silent.

The 1958 *Statement* provides: "Suspension of the faculty member during the proceedings is justified only if immediate harm to the faculty member or others is threatened by the faculty member's continuance. Unless legal considerations forbid, any such suspension should be with pay." A suspension which is not followed by either reinstatement or the opportunity for a hearing is in effect a summary dismissal in violation of academic due process.

The concept of "moral turpitude" identifies the exceptional case in which the professor may be denied a year's teaching or pay in whole or in part. The statement applies to that kind of behavior which goes beyond simply warranting discharge and is so utterly blameworthy as to make it inappropriate to require the offering of a year's teaching or pay. The standard is not that the moral sensibilities of persons in the particular community have been affronted. The standard is behavior that would evoke condemnation by the academic community generally.

## ENDORSERS

Association of American Colleges and Universities	1941
American Association of University Professors	1941
American Library Association (adapted for librarians)	1946
Association of American Law Schools	1946
American Political Science Association	1947
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education	1950

American Association for Higher Education	1950
Eastern Psychological Association	1950
Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology	1953
American Psychological Association	1961
American Historical Association	1961
Modern Language Association of America	1962
American Economic Association	1962
American Agricultural Economics Association	1962
Midwest Sociological Society	1963
Organization of American Historians	1963
American Philological Association	1963
American Council of Learned Societies	1963
Speech Communication Association	1963
American Sociological Association	1963
Southern Historical Association	1963
American Studies Association	1963
Association of American Geographers	1963
Southern Economic Association	1963
Classical Association of the Middle West and South	1964
Southwestern Social Science Association	1964
Archaeological Institute of America	1964
Southern Management Association	1964
American Theatre Association	1964
South Central Modern Language Association	1964
Southwestern Philosophical Society	1964
Council of Independent Colleges	1965
Mathematical Association of America	1965
Arizona-Nevada Academy of Science	1965
American Risk and Insurance Association	1965
Academy of Management	1965
American Catholic Historical Association	1966
American Catholic Philosophical Association	1966
Association for Education in Journalism	1966
Western History Association	1966
Mountain-Plains Philosophical Conference	1966
Society of American Archivists	1966
Southeastern Psychological Association	1966
Southern Speech Communication Association	1966
American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies	1967
American Mathematical Society	1967
College Theology Society	1967
Council on Social Work Education	1967
American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy	1967
American Academy of Religion	1967
Association for the Sociology of Religion	1967
American Society of Journalism School Administrators	1967
John Dewey Society	1967
South Atlantic Modern Language Association	1967
American Finance Association	1967
Association for Social Economics	1967
United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa	1968
American Society of Christian Ethics	1968
American Association of Teachers of French	1968

Eastern Finance Association	1968
American Association for Chinese Studies	1968
American Society of Plant Physiologists	1968
University Film and Video Association	1968
American Dialect Society	1968
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association	1968
Association of Social and Behavioral Scientists	1968
College English Association	1968
National College Physical Education Association for Men	1969
American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association	1969
History of Education Society	1969
Council for Philosophical Studies	1969
American Musicological Society	1969
American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese	1969
Texas Junior College Teachers Association	1970
College Art Association of America	1970
Society of Professors of Education	1970
American Anthropological Association	1970
Association of Theological Schools	1970
American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism	1971
American Business Law Association	1971
American Council for the Arts	1972
New York State Mathematics Association of Two-Year Colleges	1972
College Language Association	1973
Pennsylvania Historical Association	1973
Massachusetts Regional Community College Faculty Association	1973
American Philosophical Association***	1974
American Classical League	1974
American Comparative Literature Association	1974
Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association	1974
Society of Architectural Historians	1975
American Statistical Association	1975
American Folklore Society	1975
Association for Asian Studies	1975
Linguistic Society of America	1975
African Studies Association	1975
American Institute of Biological Sciences	1975
North American Conference on British Studies	1975
Sixteenth-Century Studies Conference	1975
Texas Association of College Teachers	1976
Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies	1976
Association for Jewish Studies	1976
Western Speech Communication Association	1976
Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education	1977
Metaphysical Society of America	1977
American Chemical Society	1977
Texas Library Association	1977
American Society for Legal History	1977
Iowa Higher Education Association	1977
American Physical Therapy Association	1979

\*\*\*Endorsed by the Association's Western Division in 1952, Eastern Division in 1953, and Pacific Division in 1962

North Central Sociological Association .....	1980
Dante Society of America .....	1980
Association for Communication Administration .....	1981
American Association of Physics Teachers .....	1982
Middle East Studies Association .....	1982
National Education Association .....	1985
American Institute of Chemists .....	1985
American Association of Teachers of German .....	1985
American Association of Teachers of Italian .....	1985
American Association for Applied Linguistics .....	1986
American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages .....	1986
American Association for Cancer Education .....	1986
American Society of Church History .....	1986
Oral History Association .....	1987
Society for French Historical Studies .....	1987
History of Science Society .....	1987
American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists .....	1988
American Association for Clinical Chemistry .....	1988
Council for Chemical Research .....	1988
Association for the Study of Higher Education .....	1988
American Psychological Society .....	1989
University and College Labor Education Association .....	1989
Society for Neuroscience .....	1989
Renaissance Society of America .....	1989
Society of Biblical Literature .....	1989
National Science Teachers Association .....	1989
Medieval Academy of America .....	1990
American Society of Agronomy .....	1990
Crop Science Society of America .....	1990
Soil Science Society of America .....	1990
Society of Protozoologists .....	1990
Society for Ethnomusicology .....	1990
American Association of Physicists in Medicine .....	1990
Animal Behavior Society .....	1990
Illinois Community College Faculty Association .....	1990
American Society for Theatre Research .....	1990
National Council of Teachers of English .....	1991
Latin American Studies Association .....	1992
Society for Cinema Studies .....	1992
American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies .....	1992
Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences .....	1992
American Society for Aesthetics .....	1992
Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies .....	1994
American Council of Teachers of Russian .....	1994
Council of Teachers of Southeast Asian Languages .....	1994
American Association of Teachers of Arabic .....	1994
Association of Teachers of Japanese .....	1994

## Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings

*The following statement was prepared by a joint committee representing the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) and the American Association of University Professors and was approved by these two associations at their annual meetings in 1958. It supplements the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure by providing a formulation of the "academic due process" that should be observed in dismissal proceedings. The exact procedural standards here set forth, however, "are not intended to establish a norm in the same manner as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, but are presented rather as a guide..."*

*The governing bodies of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges, meeting respectively in November 1989 and January 1990, adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.*

### INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Any approach toward settling the difficulties which have beset dismissal proceedings on many American campuses must look beyond procedure into setting and cause. A dismissal proceeding is a symptom of failure; no amount of use of removal process will help strengthen higher education as much as will the cultivation of conditions in which dismissals rarely if ever need occur.

Just as the board of control or other governing body is the legal and fiscal corporation of the college, the faculty is the academic entity. Historically, the academic corporation is the older. Faculties were formed in the Middle Ages, with managerial affairs either self-arranged or handled in course by the parent church. Modern college faculties, on the other hand, are part of a complex and extensive structure requiring legal incorporation, with stewards and managers specifically appointed to discharge certain functions.

Nonetheless, the faculty of a modern college constitutes an entity as real as that of the faculties of medieval times, in terms of collective purpose and function. A necessary precondition of a strong faculty is that it have first-hand concern with its own membership. This is properly reflected both in appointments to and in separations from the faculty body.

A well-organized institution will reflect sympathetic understanding by trustees and teachers alike of their respective and complementary roles. These should be spelled out carefully in writing and made available to all. Trustees and faculty should understand and agree on their several functions in determining who shall join and who shall remain on the faculty. One of the prime duties of the administrator is to help preserve understanding of those functions. It seems clear on the American college scene that a close positive relationship exists between the excellence of colleges, the strength of their faculties, and the extent of faculty responsibility in determining [faculty membership. Such a condition is in no way inconsistent with full faculty awareness of institutional factors with which governing boards must be primarily concerned.

In the effective college, a dismissal proceeding involving a faculty member on tenure, or one occurring during the term of an appointment, will be a rare exception, caused by individual human weakness and not by an unhealthy setting. When it does come, however, the college should be prepared for it, so that both institutional integrity and individual human rights may be

# NISG

Northern Iowa Student Government

RESOLUTION: SSR 98-15

A RESOLUTION FOR: Recommended Change In The University Operational Manual Section II.5.

SPONSORED BY: Student Affairs Committee

Date of First Reading: Oct 29 1997 Date of Second Reading: Nov. 5, 1997

SENATE ACTION: Passed: \_\_\_\_\_ Failed: X

VOTE: 0 35 2  
yes no abstentions

SPEAKERS ACTION: Paul Gorecki 11/7  
Speaker - Paul Gorecki Date

\*\*\*\*\*

**WHEREAS:** The Student Affairs Committee reviewed a proposal submitted to Faculty Senate and the Northern Iowa Student Government; and

**WHEREAS:** The Committee feels that certain areas of the written proposal submitted by Elaine Jaquith contains enough merit as to demand a change in University policy; and

**BELIEVING:** that a student should not have to choose between their beliefs and grades especially when the learning ability of a student is not dependent upon their exposure to sexually explicit material; and

**FURTHERMORE BELIEVING:** that current University policy in the "Responsibilities to Students" paragraph II.5 omits written material from criteria considered sexually explicit and penalizes students who choose not to attend the particular class session which contains such material, by holding them responsible for learning the content of the missed class session.

**BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT:** UNI policy section "Responsibilities to Students" paragraph II.5 be amended to read as follows:

Faculty members may decide for sound pedagogical reasons that it is necessary to use course materials that include sexually explicit material. Students must be notified forty-eight hours in advance of a class session offering sexually explicit photos or films. Students will neither be penalized for not reading written material, nor for attending a specific class session if such material is to be offered, but students are responsible for demonstrating their understanding of the objectives of the course or program.

Whenever students voluntarily withdraw from participation due to sexually explicit course material, the instructor must allow make-up work in an area not offered in the formal sexually explicit section of the course if students' grades are dependent upon such participation. Make-up work must not exceed the requirements of any missed course work.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:** Copies of this resolution be forwarded to Hans Isakson, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, Russell Campbell, Chairman of the University Policies Commission, Dr. Yousefi, Chairman of the General Education Committee and the Committee on Curricula, and John Somervill, Chairman of the Human Rights Commission for review and consideration.

## Professional Ethics and Responsibility

### Board-Approved Policy for UNI:

"Faculty members may decide for sound pedagogical reasons that it is necessary to use course materials that include representations of human sexual acts. When such materials involve photo or film depictions, information sufficient to enable individual students to make a knowledgeable choice about whether to take that course, or attend a specific class session must be made available. Students will not be penalized for not attending a specific class session if such material is to be shown, but students are responsible for learning the content of the class session."

### Board-Approved Policy for SUI:

"In order to facilitate student learning, faculty members should present the appropriate context for course content because learning is furthered when students are adequately prepared to deal with course materials. While students are responsible for learning class materials and completing course requirements, faculty should respect decisions by students, based on the exercise of their own intellectual freedom, to not attend part or all of a particular class session."

### Proposed Policy Approved by UNI Faculty Senate:

"Because student learning is furthered when students are adequately prepared to deal with course materials, faculty should set course content in an appropriate context."

## UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA FACULTY SENATE

Calendar Number: 666

Docket: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: Resolution from Northern Iowa Student Government regarding Course Packets

### Standard Motions

- \_\_\_ 1. Place at head of the docket, out of regular order.
- \_\_\_ 2. Docket in regular order.
- \_\_\_ 3. Docket because of special circumstances for \_\_\_\_\_  
and notify sender(s).
- \_\_\_ 4. Refer to (standing committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 5. Refer to (administrative officer) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 6. Return to (ad hoc committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 7. Return to petitioner with request for a more specific proposal.
- \_\_\_ 8. Return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation.
- \_\_\_ 9. Return to petitioner because of decision not to docket at this time.
- \_\_\_ 10. Other procedural disposition \_\_\_\_\_

---

### NOTES

*Northern Iowa Student Government*



**UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA FACULTY SENATE**

Calendar Number: 667

Docket: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: Request for Emeritus Status from Argelia C. Hawley, Department of Teaching.

**Standard Motions**

- \_\_\_ 1. Place at head of the docket, out of regular order.
- \_\_\_ 2. Docket in regular order.
- \_\_\_ 3. Docket because of special circumstances for \_\_\_\_\_  
and notify sender(s).
- \_\_\_ 4. Refer to (standing committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 5. Refer to (administrative officer) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 6. Return to (ad hoc committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 7. Return to petitioner with request for a more specific proposal.
- \_\_\_ 8. Return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation.
- \_\_\_ 9. Return to petitioner because of decision not to docket at this time.
- \_\_\_ 10. Other procedural disposition \_\_\_\_\_

---

**NOTES**

**Request for Emeritus Status  
University of Northern Iowa**

Date 30 August 1997

1. Name Argelia C. Hawley 2. Department Teaching

3. I wish to retire from my position as Instructor in Teaching  
at the University of Northern Iowa, effective May 31 1997  
(Month) (Day) (Year)

4. I have twenty or more years of creditable service in higher education. (List institutions and dates of employment.)

Sacramento State University 1961-62

University of Wyoming 1963-64

University of Northern Iowa 1976-97

5. My desire in regard to part-time employment by the University is:

☐ I wish to be considered for part-time employment next year.

☐ I am not interested in part-time employment by the University for the next year, but may be at some future time.

☒ I am not interested in part-time employment, except for special assignments

6. If I am employed by the University on a part-time basis, I understand that the period and nature of such employment shall be at the convenience of the University and shall be determined annually.

Approved and Accepted:

Roger Kuster  
Department Head

Thomas T. Stitzer  
Dean of College

Christine A. Macfarlane  
Chair of College Committee

[Signature]  
Vice President and Provost

University Faculty Senate

President

Argelia C. Hawley  
(Signature)

9/4/97  
(Date)

9-8-97  
(Date)

11-16-97  
(Date)

11-10-97  
(Date)

(Date)

(Date)

Please prepare six (6) copies of this form; sign all six (6) and submit to your department head. When the form processing has been completed, a copy will be returned to you, your department head, College Dean, Vice President and Provost, President and Personnel Services.

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA FACULTY SENATE**

Calendar Number: 668

Docket: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: Report from the Ad Hoc Senate Administrative Operations Committee

**Standard Motions**

- \_\_\_ 1. Place at head of the docket, out of regular order.
- \_\_\_ 2. Docket in regular order.
- \_\_\_ 3. Docket because of special circumstances for \_\_\_\_\_  
\_ and notify sender(s).
- \_\_\_ 4. Refer to (standing committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 5. Refer to (administrative officer) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 6. Return to (ad hoc committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 7. Return to petitioner with request for a more specific proposal.
- \_\_\_ 8. Return to petitioner with request for additional information and  
documentation.
- \_\_\_ 9. Return to petitioner because of decision not to docket at this time.
- \_\_\_ 10. Other procedural disposition \_\_\_\_\_

---

**NOTES**

## BUDGET REQUEST FORM

Organization/Individual Submitting Budget Request: Ad Hoc Senate Administrative Operations

Project Title: Faculty Senate Budget Committee

Fiscal Year: 1998

### Part I: Budget Request

	Recurring	One-Time
Faculty Salaries	<u>\$10,000</u>	<u>                    </u>
Staff Salaries	<u>38,000</u>	<u>                    </u>
Supplies and Services	<u>11,000</u>	<u>                    </u>
Equipment	<u>                    </u>	<u>\$5,000</u>
Other (Identify)	<u>                    </u>	<u>                    </u>
TOTAL	<u>\$59,000</u>	<u>\$5,000</u>

### Part II: Priority Ranking

Signature

College Senate Priority	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Budget Committee Priority	<u>                    </u>	<u>                    </u>

### Part III: Justification/Explanation

The purpose of this proposal is to consolidate the resource needs of the Faculty Senate into a single budget under the control of the Faculty Senate. This proposal supports the intellectual vitality, community, and resource goals of the University Strategic Plan. Please see the attached budget and rationale statement for additional details.

Proposed Faculty Governance Budget - FY1998

\$38,000.00	<p>Administrative Assistant.</p> <p>The duties of the administrative assistant would be as follows (Note: In discussing this position with Mr. Mixsell, Director of Human Resources, the position would be either a Secretary III or Clerk IV, salary range with benefits for either position would be \$32,000 to \$43,000) :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Record, transcribe, and distribute the minutes of Senate meetings.</li><li>2. Record, transcribe, and distribute as appropriate the minutes of Senate committee meetings (Curriculum committee, E.P.C., etc.)</li><li>3. Archive, cross reference, and index faculty activities (Minutes of Senate meetings, calendar items, minutes of Senate and Faculty committee meetings, etc.).</li><li>4. Edit the University Catalogue.</li><li>5. Be available to assist departments and individuals writing proposed curricular changes.</li><li>6. Be available to assist faculty and others in researching past faculty actions and deliberations.</li><li>7. Assist the Chair of the Faculty and the Chair of the Senate with their functions and responsibilities (Preparing agendas, calendar items, distribution of notices, etc.).</li></ol>
\$ 6,504.00	<p>Office overhead.</p> <p>This would include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Telephone expense (\$17.00/month - \$204.00).</li><li>2. Printing and duplication expense (\$6,000.00 - Senate and faculty minutes, approximately \$225.00/meeting, announcements for meetings and elections, agendas, calendar items for Senators, University ballots, etc. ).</li><li>3. Office supplies (paper, envelopes, folders, binders, etc. - \$200.00).</li><li>4. Miscellaneous office expenses (postage - \$100.00)</li></ol>
\$ 10,000.00	<p>Salary for adjunct replacement for release time for faculty officers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Release time adjunct for Chair of the Faculty. The Chair of the Faculty should be given release time for Fall and Spring Semesters. This position is to reimburse the Chair of the Faculty's department for this release time. The Chair of the Faculty's department should be free to use these funds as it sees fit.</li><li>2. Release time adjunct for Chair of the Senate. The Chair of the Senate should be given release time for the Fall and Spring Semesters. This position is to reimburse the Chair of the Senate's department for this release time. The Chair of the Senate's department should be free to use these funds as it sees fit.</li></ol>
\$1,000.00	<p>Non-office expenses.</p> <p>This would include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. General faculty meetings. (Room rent, refreshments, etc.)</li><li>2. Travel to Board of Regents Meetings.</li><li>3. Senate retreats.</li><li>4. Other non-office expenses.</li></ol>
\$5,000.00	<p>One-time, start-up expenses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 233 MHZ Pentium computer with 6 gbyt hard drive, ether-net card, tape, zip, or jaz backup and 17" SVGA monitor.</li><li>2. "Industrial strength" laser printer.</li><li>3. Ether-net connection to COBRA.</li><li>4. File cabinets and other furniture (Should be able to get most of this from storage).</li></ol>

## Rationale for Faculty Governance Budget Request

There are six major reasons that justify the attached budget request.

First, the Faculty Senate has a long history at UNI of receiving very little direct financial support. Much of the work of the Senate has been supported by departments that support faculty who do the work, giving them release time and service recognition for their efforts. Some other Senate expenses have been funded out of other budgets on campus. For example, the Provost's office has been funding much of the copying, duplicating, and other needs of the Senate's Committee on Curriculum, and the Graduate School has been funding much of the copying, duplicating, and other needs of the Senate's Graduate Council and Graduate Curriculum Committee. However, these indirect funding arrangements, helpful as they are, weaken the ties between the Senate and three of its most important committees. Therefore, one of the most important reasons for providing the Faculty Senate an adequate budget to fulfill its responsibilities is that doing so will strengthen the ties between the Senate and its curriculum committees.

Second, the proposed budget will provide a new continuity to the Faculty Senate. Given the staggered offices of Senators and the two consecutive terms limit for Senators, many new faces appear on the Senate each year. Turnover in the Senate Chairs and Vice Chairs is also high. Thus, very few people remain on the Senate from year to year with a commitment to continuing the efforts begun by past Senates. The Administrative Secretary position in the proposed budget will be a major source for continuity now missing from the Senate. Additional continuity will be provided by the Administrative Secretary, who will archive, index, and track Faculty Senate actions. This administrative support will enable the Senate to conduct its business in a much more efficient and professional manner than in the past. Currently, archiving, indexing, and tracking of Senate business is performed by volunteer faculty, purely out of their sense of duty to the faculty.

Third, the proposed budget will put the Faculty Senate on a par with its sister Regents' institutions (ISU and SUI) in terms of the amount of support the Senate receives from its university. Although the proposed budget is not as large as those of the Faculty Senate's at ISU and SUI, it is on a par with their budgets in terms of university support. The ISU and SUI Faculty Senate budgets are larger, because these universities have larger faculties.

Fourth, the Administrative Secretary position in the proposed budget will be also providing the faculty support in maintaining and editing the University Catalogue. This task is one of the most important in the University, yet no single person is assigned to it. Furthermore, the curricula of the University are one of the most important responsibilities of the faculty. Thus, it is highly appropriate and functional for the Administrative Secretary of the Faculty Senate to perform this important task.

Fifth, the proposed budget will make service on the Faculty Senate more attractive to faculty. Currently, many faculty are reluctant to serve on the Senate, because the Senate gets so little support from the University.

Last, but not least, the proposed budget recognizes in a single budget the scope and size of the responsibilities of the Faculty Senate. This recognition puts the Faculty Senate in a better position not only to fulfill its responsibilities, but also to take a proactive, more focused approach in faculty leadership. Growth in the University

(number of faculty) over the past few decades has created an ever-increasing need for an effective and professional Faculty Senate. Yet, the direct budget of the Senate has not keep pace with these growing responsibilities of the Senate. The proposed budget will help to solve this problem. The size of the faculty at the University has grown considerably over the past few decades, making the Proposed Budget about \$100 per faculty member. Recently, the University administration instituted a user fee of \$120 per year for faculty who wish to make use of the new Wellness Center and other exercise facilities on campus. One of the arguments made by the administration to support this fee was that the fee was small, namely a mere \$10 per month, and most faculty could afford it. On a per faculty basis the Proposed Budget is even less expensive than the user fee for the Wellness Center.

In summary, the ever increasing complexities and expanding responsibilities of the Faculty Senate warrant the consolidation of the support it receives into a single budget under the control of the Faculty Senate.



**UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA FACULTY SENATE**

Calendar Number: 669

Docket: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: Report from the Senate Budget Committee on New Spending Proposals

**Standard Motions**

- \_\_\_ 1. Place at head of the docket, out of regular order.
- \_\_\_ 2. Docket in regular order.
- \_\_\_ 3. Docket because of special circumstances for \_\_\_\_\_  
and notify sender(s).
- \_\_\_ 4. Refer to (standing committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 5. Refer to (administrative officer) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 6. Return to (ad hoc committee) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ 7. Return to petitioner with request for a more specific proposal.
- \_\_\_ 8. Return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation.
- \_\_\_ 9. Return to petitioner because of decision not to docket at this time.
- \_\_\_ 10. Other procedural disposition \_\_\_\_\_

---

**NOTES**





October 29, 1997

To: All UNI Faculty

From: Hans Isakson, Chair, University Faculty Senate *HS*  
Bud Bowlin, Chair, University Faculty Senate Budget Committee *BB*

Subj: Budget Procedures

As part of the Provost's plan to decentralize the budget, the Provost has asked that the University Faculty Senate participate in the budgetary process by making recommendations concerning budget requests for new spending. The first such opportunity is for fiscal years (FYs) 1998-99 (July 1, 1998 - June 30, 1999) and 1999-2000 (July 1, 1999 - June 30, 2000) budgets. Hence, the University Faculty Senate is now soliciting proposals for new spending for these fiscal years. New spending proposals can be either for new initiatives or enhancement of current projects. Proposals can cover any area that might fall under the purview of Academic Affairs. Examples are funding requests to support distance education, new degree programs, new course offerings, cross-disciplinary programs, scholarships for travel abroad, matching funds for externally funded grants, and undergraduate research.

Proposals for the FY 1998-99 budget will be considered by the Provost in her allocation of that year's funding. Proposals for FY 1999-2000 funding will be considered for submission to the Board of Regents for consideration. It should be noted that the amount of funds available for new spending in FY 1998-99 can only come from internal reprogramming by the Provost since the Governor's budget for FY 1998-99 has been set and will be submitted to the legislature in January 1998. This reprogramming comes from the Provost's 2% reallocation pool and tuition increases less set asides for student scholarships. Consequently, the amount of funds available to support new spending requests for FY 1998-99 is limited. Faculty proposals must compete with other budgetary priorities as determined by the Provost. New spending proposals for FY 1999-2000 are not restricted as to availability of funds at this point in the budgetary process.

To submit a request for new spending, obtain a budget request form and detailed instructions for completing and processing the form from your college faculty senate/council chair. Each new spending proposal should have its own budget request form. After the faculty member completes the budget request form, it should be forwarded to the college faculty senate/council for approval and prioritization within the college. You should contact your college faculty senate/council for the date by which the form must be submitted to them. After indicating its approval and prioritization, the college faculty senate will forward the completed form to Bud Bowlin, Chair, University Faculty Senate Budget Committee, Department of Accounting, mail code 0127 by November 19, 1997. The Budget Committee will make approval and prioritization recommendations on the requests to the University Faculty Senate at the Senate's December 8, 1997 meeting. The University Faculty Senate will then forward its recommendations to the Provost.

The faculty involvement in the budgetary process will parallel but be independent of the traditional budget process through department heads, deans, and Academic Affairs Council. Faculty are encouraged to submit their requests for new spending through both channels, the faculty governance channel and the administrative channel.

The above process is intended as an interim measure developed in response to the short lead time available for submissions for the FY 1998-99 and 1999-2000 budgets. We apologize for the short suspense. The University Faculty Senate Budget Committee will be refining the procedures for proposals for subsequent years.